

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ARTHUR J. BURTON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 1:05-cv-289
)	
v.)	Honorable David W. McKeague
)	
LORNE DEROOY et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION
DENYING LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* - THREE STRIKES

Plaintiff Arthur J. Burton, a prisoner incarcerated at Oaks Correctional Facility, filed a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Because Plaintiff has filed at least three lawsuits which were dismissed as frivolous, he is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Court will order Plaintiff to pay the \$250.00 civil action filing fee within thirty days of this opinion and accompanying order, and if Plaintiff fails to do so, the Court will order that his action be dismissed without prejudice. Even if the case is dismissed, Plaintiff will be responsible for payment of the \$250.00 filing fee in accordance with *In re Alea*, 286 F.3d 378, 380-81 (6th Cir. 2002).

Discussion

The Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996), which was enacted on April 26, 1996, amended the procedural rules governing a prisoner’s request for the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis*. As the Sixth Circuit has stated, the PLRA

was “aimed at the skyrocketing numbers of claims filed by prisoners—many of which are meritless—and the corresponding burden those filings have placed on the federal courts.” *Hampton v. Hobbs*, 106 F.3d 1281, 1286 (6th Cir. 1997). For that reason, Congress put into place economic incentives to prompt a prisoner to “stop and think” before filing a complaint. *Id.* For example, a prisoner is liable for the civil action filing fee, and if the prisoner qualifies to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the prisoner may pay the fee through partial payments as outlined in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b). The constitutionality of the fee requirements of the PLRA has been upheld by the Sixth Circuit. *Id.* at 1288.

In addition, another provision reinforces the “stop and think” aspect of the PLRA by preventing a prisoner from proceeding *in forma pauperis* when the prisoner repeatedly files meritless lawsuits. Known as the “three-strikes” rule, the provision states:

In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under [the section governing proceedings *in forma pauperis*] if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The statutory restriction “[i]n no event,” found in § 1915(g), is express and unequivocal. The statute does allow an exception for a prisoner who is “under imminent danger of serious physical injury.” The Sixth Circuit has upheld the constitutionality of the “three-strikes” rule against arguments that it violates equal protection, the right of access to the courts, and due process, and that it constitutes a bill of attainder and is *ex post facto* legislation. *Wilson v. Yaklich*, 148 F.3d 596, 604-606 (6th Cir.1998); *accord Rodriguez v. Cook*, 169 F.3d 1176, 1178-82 (9th Cir. 1999);

Rivera v. Allin, 144 F.3d 719, 723-26 (11th Cir. 1998); *Carson v. Johnson*, 112 F.3d 818, 821-22 (5th Cir. 1997).

Plaintiff has been an active litigant in the federal courts in Michigan. In more than three of Plaintiff's lawsuits, the Court entered dismissals on the grounds of frivolous, malicious or failed to state a claim. *See Burton v. Bock*, No. 2:95-cv-71689 (E.D. Mich. March 27, 1996) (frivolous); *Burton v. Nault*, No. 2:89-cv-231 (W.D. Mich. Aug. 8, 1990) (failure to state a claim); *Burton v. Robinson*, No. 2:89-cv-73482 (E.D. Mich. March 14, 1990) (frivolous). Although all three of the dismissals were entered before enactment of the PLRA on April 26, 1996, the dismissals nevertheless count as strikes. *See Wilson*, 148 F.3d at 604. Further, the Court also previously has denied leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* under the three-strikes rule. *See Burton v. Gundy*, No. 1:96-cv-986 (W.D. Mich. March 3, 1997). Moreover, Plaintiff's allegations do not fall within the exception to the three strikes rule because he does not allege any facts establishing that he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.¹

In light of the foregoing, § 1915(g) prohibits Plaintiff from proceeding *in forma pauperis* in this action. Plaintiff has thirty days from the date of entry of this order to pay the entire civil action filing fee, which is \$250.00. When Plaintiff pays his filing fee, the Court will screen his complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c). If Plaintiff fails to pay the

¹The Court notes that this is the third action filed by Plaintiff regarding the incident alleged to have occurred on May 17, 2002. On the prior two occasions, Plaintiff's claims were dismissed for lack of exhaustion. *See Burton v. DeRooy*, No. 1:03-cv-126 (W.D. Mich.) (dismissed for failure to state a claim; affirmed on appeal on alternative ground of lack of total exhaustion); *Burton v. Gundy*, No. 1:02-cv-655 (W.D. Mich.) (dismissed for lack of exhaustion). Although the facts alleged in the instant case are substantially the same, Plaintiff will not be permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the instant case. The prior cases were filed within a relatively short period following the alleged incident of excessive force by a group of officers. In the instant case, however, nearly three years have passed since the incident and Plaintiff has failed to identify any subsequent conduct establishing that he remains in danger from these officers. As a consequence, Plaintiff fails to allege imminent danger of serious physical injury.

filing fee within the thirty-day period, his case will be dismissed without prejudice, but he will continue to be responsible for payment of the \$250.00 filing fee.

Dated: May 6, 2005

/s/ David W. McKeague
David W. McKeague
United States District Judge

SEND REMITTANCES TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS:

Clerk, U.S. District Court
399 Federal Building
110 Michigan Street, NW
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

All checks or other forms of payment shall be payable to “Clerk, U.S. District Court.”